United Nations S/2001/21

Security Council

Distr.: General
8 January 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 8 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Singapore to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

We are currently seeing another resurgence of United Nations peacekeeping operations. This would therefore be an appropriate moment to review measures that could be taken to strengthen their effectiveness. The report of the Panel on United Nations peace operations (A/55/305-S/2000/809), established by you, has generated significant momentum towards the achievement of this goal. Both the Security Council and the General Assembly have endorsed various recommendations of the Security Council working group and the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations on the Panel's report.

One issue that surfaced was the clearly felt need for greater consultation between troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat. However, more could be done in this area. We should consider going beyond closer consultation to strengthening cooperation between the three partners.

I am therefore pleased to inform you that an open debate on strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries will be organized by Singapore during its Presidency of the Security Council in January 2001. We wish to encourage the troop-contributing countries and other Members States to take this opportunity to share their experience, present their views and contribute constructive and useful suggestions to the discussion. We hope that as a result of this exercise some concrete recommendations will emerge.

I am also pleased to enclose two papers on this subject (see annex and enclosure). The papers provide background to the issue as well as suggesting some specific questions that could be addressed by participants in the open debate. I hope that the Member States and the Secretariat will find the papers useful in preparing for the debate.

I would appreciate it if the present letter, its annex and enclosure could be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Kishore **Mahbubani**
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary

01-20560 (E) 090101

Annex to the letter dated 8 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Singapore to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries

Introduction

1. After a steady decline in United Nations peacekeeping activities in recent years, United Nations peacekeeping is once again seeing resurgence. New United Nations peacekeeping operations have been deployed in Sierra Leone (United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL)) and Ethiopia and Eritrea (United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE)). Another, to the Democratic Republic of the Congo (United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC)), awaits full deployment. The number of troops, military observers and civilian police personnel has risen to about 40,000 from approximately 15,000 a year ago. More peacekeepers are expected to be deployed in 2001. Some United Nations peacekeeping operations have also expanded significantly in scope. Complex, multidisciplinary United Nations peacekeeping missions in the form of interim administrations are in place in Kosovo (United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK)) and East Timor (United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET)).

2. However, in the midst of this resurgence, United Nations peacekeeping suffered a serious setback when several hundred UNAMSIL troops were detained by Revolutionary United Front of Sierra Leone (RUF) rebels in May 2000. An assessment team despatched by the Secretary-General to Sierra Leone concluded that there were many reasons for this setback. One reason, which again came to the fore was lack of cooperation and consultation between the United Nations Security Council and the troop-contributing countries. This is déjà vu. Having witnessed how similar problems plagued the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in the Balkans and the United Nations Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM) in Somalia, and determined not to repeat the same mistakes, efforts were made in the early 1990s which led to concrete steps being taken to improve cooperation and coordination between troop-contributing countries and the Security Council. These were enshrined in two presidential statements (S/PRST/1994/62 dated 4 November 1994 and S/PRST/1996/13 dated 28 March 1996).

3. Significantly, in the latter presidential statement on enhancing consultations among troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat (S/PRST/1996/13), the Council stated that "the Security Council will continue to keep arrangements for consultations and the exchange of information and views with troop contributors and prospective contributors under review and stands ready to consider further measures and new mechanisms to enhance further the arrangements in the light of experience." Against the backdrop of the recent experiences of United Nations peacekeeping operations and in order to build upon the momentum to strengthen the capacity of the United Nations in the peacekeeping field generated by the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations of 21 August 2000 (the "Brahimi report" A/55/305-S/2000/809), it is perhaps time for the Council to undertake such a consideration.

Recent efforts to enhance cooperation with troop-contributing countries

4. The issue of cooperation between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries was addressed by the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, including the link between the commitment gaps in the provision of troops for United Nations peacekeeping operations and the need for better coordination and consultation between troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat. In his report on the implementation of the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, issued on 20 October 2000 (A/55/502), the Secretary-General reiterated this need. The issue was also referred to by many delegations during the Fourth Committee general debate on the "Comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects" from 8 to 10 November 2000, during the fifty-fifth session of the General Assembly. Both the Security Council (resolution 1327 (2000) of 13 November 2000) and the General Assembly (resolution 55/135 of 8 December 2000) adopted resolutions endorsing the recommendations of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations on strengthening consultations between troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat.

5. Significantly, in its resolution 1327 (2000), the Security Council stated its commitment to hold private meetings with the troop-contributing countries at various stages of the establishment and implementation of United Nations peacekeeping operations. Under this arrangement, the Council would meet the troop-contributing countries directly with the Secretariat. This is potentially a significant improvement over the meetings with troop-contributing countries established by the Security Council via S/PRST/1996/13, in which the meetings were in substance between the Secretariat and the troop-contributing countries, although they were chaired by the President of the Security Council.

6. Interestingly, even before resolution 1327 (2000) was adopted, a private meeting was held with the troop contributors to UNAMSIL, on 4 October 2000, to seek their views before the Security Council Mission to Sierra Leone, led by Ambassador Sir Jeremy Greenstock of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, travelled to Sierra Leone. Many troop-contributing countries found the meeting to be very useful, especially since it was an interactive meeting. It would seem that in committing to hold private meetings with troop-contributing countries in resolution 1327 (2000), the Council decided to formalize such a meeting format. This view was supported by the Permanent Representative of Bangladesh to the United Nations, Ambassador Anwarul Karim Chowdhury, at the Security Council formal meeting to adopt resolution 1327 (2000), at which he stated that it was the understanding of the Council that such meetings would be in the format of the 4 October 2000 meeting on UNAMSIL. These consultations, whatever the provisions of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, should be neither traditional troop-contributor meetings nor private formal meetings in the Council Chamber. Rather, they should be in a format that allows a free exchange of views between Council members and the troop-contributing countries, and they should include the necessary substantive briefings.

Security Council open debate on strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries on 16 January 2001

7. The Security Council open debate on strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries on 16 January 2001, which will be held during Singapore's Presidency of the Council, is intended to provide an opportunity for United Nations Member States to discuss and give their views on fostering a new spirit of cooperation between troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat. Much effort has been spent in the last decade to fortify this cooperation, which is a cornerstone of United Nations peacekeeping activities. However, more can be done. In this regard, the open debate on 16 January 2001 would be an opportunity for Member States to address the following key questions.

(a) Conduct of meetings with troop-contributing countries

It should be acknowledged that a step forward was made in formalizing a process of consultations between the Security Council, the Secretariat and the troop-contributing countries through the establishment of the meetings between them. Many of the guidelines for meetings of troop-contributing countries established by S/PRST/1994/62 and S/PRST/1996/13 continue to be valid and if these guidelines had been implemented fully, not just in form, but more importantly in spirit, these meetings had the potential of becoming the principal process for cooperation and coordination between the Council, the Secretariat and troop-contributing countries on peacekeeping matters. Unfortunately, in practice, the meetings have become pro forma and ritualistic and have fallen short of the expectations of the troop-contributing countries. How could we therefore improve the content and form of private meetings with troop-contributing countries to make them more interactive and productive?

(b) Strengthening the link between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries in peacekeeping

In addition to meetings, what other mechanisms can be used to strengthen the link between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries in peacekeeping? In a Security Council open debate on "No exit without strategy" on 15 November 2000, Ambassador Sir Jeremy Greenstock commented that he thought that the Brahimi report covers a lot of what we want. I am not sure that we do not need a special subcommittee of the Council on peacekeeping operations to take up some of these professional and detailed points. It may be useful to hear the views of Member States on his suggestion.

(c) Cooperation between the troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat in addressing problems in peacekeeping

Participants may also wish to suggest how the relationship with troop-contributing countries can go beyond consultations to real cooperation between the three crucial partners in United Nations peacekeeping. In this connection, we may need to address the commitment gaps in the contribution of troops to United Nations peacekeeping operations, the previous failures and shortcomings of United Nations peacekeeping operations, and the problems concerning the safety and security of the United Nations peacekeepers. How can the troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat cooperate to tackle these problems?

8. We have no preconceived notions of the likely desirable outcomes of this open debate. Its main purpose is to provide all participants in United Nations peacekeeping an opportunity to reflect on recent experiences, with a view to distilling some lessons that can be learnt. We hope that as a result of this exercise, some concrete recommendations will emerge that will lead to a better relationship between the troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat, and to a new spirit of cooperation among the three partners.

Enclosure

Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries — Background

Early 1990s

1. In their book, *The Procedure of the United Nations Security Council, Third Edition*, Bailey and Daws gave the following account of what transpired on the issue of consultations between the troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat in the early 1990s:

> The significant increase in the cost of peacekeeping operations in the early 1990s, for which all Member States were liable, coupled with the transition in some operations from peacekeeping to peace enforcement, with attendant greater risk for peacekeeping participants, led to calls from non-members of the Council for a greater input into decision-making on peacekeeping.
>
> In May 1993, at the initiative of the Secretary-General, the 'first meeting of troop contributors' took place, in connection with the United Nations Protection Force. Such meetings increased in frequency, but did not satisfy all the concerns of non-members.
>
> In May 1994, the Council acknowledged 'the need for enhanced consultations and exchange of information with troop-contributing countries, regarding peacekeeping operations including their planning, management and coordination'. Following this statement, the Council made some contentious decisions on changes to the mandates of ongoing peacekeeping operations. Many troop-contributing countries felt that this showed that existing methods of consultation were fine for information sharing but inadequate when a question of change to an operation's mandate was involved. Specific criticisms were that consultations had not been held 'in good time', that inadequate background information had been supplied, and that there was little indication that anything said by non-members would influence subsequent decisions of the Council.
>
> Reflecting these concerns, Argentina and New Zealand requested that the President of the Council call a meeting to consider procedural questions concerning the operation of the Council in this area. The two countries believed that an institutionalisation of consultation mechanisms was desirable and suggested the convening of a standing committee of the Council to review regularly reports on peacekeeping missions and to provide for consultations with non-members. A number of other States wrote letters to the President endorsing the concerns of Argentina and New Zealand. Egypt pointed out that the overwhelming majority of United Nations peacekeeping forces and observers came from States not members of the Council. Egypt endorsed the proposal that the Council establish a subsidiary organ for the purpose of consultations, under the provisions of Article 29[1] of the United Nations

[1] "The Security Council may establish such subsidiary organs as it deems necessary for the performance of its function."

Charter. It also argued that the Council should apply the spirit of Article 44[2] of the United Nations Charter. Austria supported efforts to include potential as well as actual troop-contributing countries in consultations between the Secretariat and the Council prior to the deployment of a new operation.

The Council duly met on 4 November 1994 and issued a presidential statement (S/PRST/1994/62) setting out procedures for consultations between members of the Security Council, troop-contributing countries, and the Secretariat. It stated that such consultations should be held 'in good time' with an informal background paper circulated well in advance; that they would be chaired jointly by the Presidency of the Council and a Secretariat representative; and would be listed in the United Nations Journal and the monthly forecast of Council work. A number of Council members felt that setting up a subsidiary organ for the purpose of undertaking consultations would reduce Council efficiency, and such a proposal was not included in the statement.

In the debate following the adoption of the statement, there was widespread support for the measures introduced. ... Some delegations, however, argued that further steps needed to be taken. Malaysia referred to a paper entitled "Political Direction and Support" produced by non-permanent members and troop-contributing countries. These States presented a detailed list of situations for which consultations should be called:

> ... when the mandate of a new peacekeeping operation was being formulated; when the concept and/or plan of operation of a peacekeeping operation was being considered; when the extension of the mandate of a peacekeeping operation was being considered; when a substantive modification of the mandate of an existing peacekeeping operation, including the broadening or narrowing of its geographical scope, changes in rules of engagement, introduction of new functions or components and so forth, was being considered; when significant developments occurred which, in the opinion of the Secretary-General, or members of the Security Council or of troop-contributing countries, were likely to affect materially the functioning of the operation or its ability to fulfil its mandate; or when the withdrawal of the operation in whole or in part was being considered.

In 1995, a new report by the Secretary-General, "Supplement to an Agenda for Peace: Position Paper of the Secretary-General on the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the United Nations" was published. On 22 February 1995, the members of the Council issued a statement (S/PRST/1995/9) in response to 'the Supplement' addressing issues such as conflict prevention, the economic and social roots of conflict, peacekeeping, disarmament, economic sanctions, and the role of regional organisations. The debate following the issuing of "the Supplement" also brought more widespread calls from States for the "institutionalisation" of consultations, and a subsidiary organ to include troop-contributing countries.

---

[2] "When the Security Council has decided to use force it shall, before calling upon a Member not represented on it to provide armed forces in fulfilment of the obligations assumed under Article 43, invite that Member, if the Member so desires, to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of the Member's armed forces."

These calls were repeated in a Council meeting on 20 December 1995 called explicitly to consider improvements to such consultations. The meeting demonstrated a clear division between four of the permanent members (France, Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States) who recognized failings in the present arrangements but who sought 'pragmatic' changes as a remedy, and thirty six troop-contributing countries who had been meeting informally, and who proposed the formal establishment of a subsidiary body. China's statement was neutral. As a result of this debate, and considerable further negotiation informally, the Council in a further presidential statement on 28 March 1996 (S/PRST/1996/13) set out further measures to strengthen consultations. The measures adopted were closer to those suggested by the permanent members than by other troop-contributing countries, in that they did not go much further toward the institutionalization of such meetings. The statement announced that meetings with troop-contributing countries would be chaired primarily by the Presidency of the Council, with support from a Secretariat representative, rather than jointly as before; that meetings would be held with prospective contributors before the establishment of a new peacekeeping operation, and that information about meetings with troop-contributing countries would be appended to the Council's annual report to the General Assembly. Some Council members notified the President of the Council that they had refrained from breaking the consensus necessary for the adoption of a presidential statement, but that they wished the Council to revisit the matter so that the de jure as well as de facto right of troop-contributing countries to express their views could be recognised by the Council. Egypt noted that the presidential statement was in the right direction since it stipulated that

> the Security Council recalls that the arrangements described above are not exhaustive. They do not preclude consultations in a variety of forms, including informal communication between the Council President or its members and troop-contributing countries and, as appropriate, with other countries especially affected, for example, countries from the region concerned and that the Security Council will continue to keep arrangements for consultations and the exchange of information and views with troop-contributing countries and prospective troop-contributing countries under review and stands ready to consider further measures and new mechanisms to enhance further the arrangements in the light of experience.

Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations and thereafter

2. Not long after the problems experienced by the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL), the issue of consultations between the troop-contributing countries and the Security Council was addressed by the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations chaired by Ambassador Lakhdar Brahimi in its report of 21 August 2000. Under the section entitled "Clear, credible and achievable mandates", the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations linked the commitment gaps in the provision of troops for United Nations Peacekeeping Operations to the

need for better coordination and consultation between the troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat. It stated that:

> "There are several ways to diminish the likelihood of such commitment gaps, including better coordination and consultation between potential troop-contributors and the members of the Security Council during the mandate formulation process. Troop-contributor advice to the Security Council might usefully be institutionalized via the establishment of ad hoc subsidiary organs of the Council, as provided for in Article 29 of the Charter. Member States contributing formed military units to an operation should as a matter of course be invited to attend Secretariat briefings of the Security Council pertaining to crises that affect the safety and security of the mission's personnel or to a change or reinterpretation of a mission's mandate with respect to the use of force."

The Report went on to recommend the following:

> "... countries that have committed military units to an operation should have access to Secretariat briefings to the Council on matters affecting the safety and security of their personnel, especially those meetings with implications for a mission's use of force".

3. In his report on the implementation of the Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations of 20 October 2000 (A/55/502), the Secretary-General supported the Panel's views on consultations between the troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat, stating the following:

> "Troop contributors will have an important role to play, because it is their military contingents who will be called upon to discharge their responsibilities professionally, in accordance with the mission mandates, the rules of engagement, and consistent with the long-established principle of 'unity of command'.
>
> "I therefore wholeheartedly concur with the Panel's assessment that closer consultation between troop contributors and the Security Council, including through new mechanisms and procedures, is needed (A/55/305-S/2000/809, para. 61). This would help to ensure that the contributors were fully aware of what was expected of them before they deployed personnel to the field, as well as during volatile situations ..."

4. The issue of consultations between the troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat was raised during the Fourth Committee general debate on the "Comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects" from 8 to 10 November 2000, during the fifty-fifth session of the General Assembly. Describing the Secretariat's place in the linkage, the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, Jean-Marie Guehenno, made the following statement:

> While it is not for the Secretariat to decide on the mandates, it is its responsibility to fully inform the Security Council and troop contributing of the implications of a particular mandate, to provide a frank appraisal of whether a proposed mandate is sufficiently clear and to provide a clear assessment of the resources required to implement the mandate and ensure the safety and security of our peacekeepers.

> On a broader level, a frank exchange of information must continue beyond the initial stages of mandate formulation. There is a need for strengthened dialogue and consultations between the Secretariat, the Security Council and troop and police contributors throughout the life of a mission in order to enable all parties concerned to make informed decisions on all aspects of an operation.
>
> Such dialogue is what helps maintain the trust required for Member States to be willing to provide the resources needed and to assume the risks entailed in deploying peacekeepers, as the Special Committee has stressed in its report.
>
> At Headquarters, in particular, we must explain to contributors the risks involved in an operation and the way we plan to address them. I plan to make myself, and my senior experts, including the military and civilian police advisers, available to provide even more frequent and comprehensive briefings for this purpose. This will enable us to not only share our assessments and plans, but also to listen to your own concerns and expectations, so that we can adequately respond to them.

5. In the same Fourth Committee general debate, speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Permanent Representative of Jordan to the United Nations, Prince Zeid Ra'ad Zeid Al-Hussein, made the following statement:

> The Council, too, should involve the troop contributors in the process of consultations, in a manner that is institutional and meaningful; one which comes into being at the earliest stages of drawing up an operation, and which persists until the termination of the operation. Unless members of the Security Council, and in particular the permanent members and those with obvious capabilities, decide themselves to meet the troop levels they mandate and to do it all themselves for the operations, particularly dangerous operations, they mandate, then a deeper sense of mutual trust must be cultivated between those who design and those who implement. It is a partnership that, in the case of UNAMSIL and numerous operations before it, has been noticeably absent. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has stressed for some time that whenever the use of force is contemplated, the Council should adhere to Articles 43 and 44 of the United Nations Charter. We therefore welcome the virtually identical comments made by the Under-Secretary-General on the topic of consultations in his presentation.

6. The Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations, Ambassador Kamalesh Sharma, in his statement during the same Fourth Committee general debate, linked the withdrawal of troops by the troop contributors to the lack of consultations between them and the Security Council. He said that:

> ... In the preparation of a peacekeeping operation's tasks and in the evolution of its mandate, the Security Council and the Secretariat must consult closely with the troop contributors, taking their advice into account. The continuing crisis in UNAMSIL illustrates why this is essential. The troop contributors will be increasingly reluctant to put their forces at risk when they are asked to discharge unrealistic tasks and when their advice based on experience gathered on the ground is not sought or not accepted when offered.
>
> There is a further systemic problem, not addressed by the Panel. It encourages the use of force, which the Council can only mandate under Chapter VII.

> Articles 43 and 44 of the Charter, in Chapter VII, lay down that the Security Council shall invite members providing armed forces "to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that Member's armed forces". The Charter requires much more than consultations; troop contributors must be able to "participate" in the Council's decisions. The Panel recommends only that troop contributors be more closely consulted, but even on this there is no evidence that the Security Council seriously wishes to go beyond its present procedures, which are completely inadequate. If the Charter provisions are not followed, if the troop contributors are not given a say in the evolution of the Council's mandates, there will be recurring crises when, in exasperation, the troop contributors pull out of operations where their units are forced to take on tasks that either cannot or should not be done.

7. In his statement during the same Fourth Committee general debate, the Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations, Ambassador Shamshad Ahmad, said that:

> Success of any peacekeeping operation can be ensured through effective management and coordination by all concerned. One important aspect is consultations between the troop contributors, the Security Council and the Secretariat. The present arrangement is not satisfactory as we all noted during the recent crisis in Sierra Leone. The Brahimi Panel's report highlights this point as well. In this regard, we have proposed the creation of a mission-specific "core group" of troop contributors who, after the establishment of a mission, will actively consult with the Security Council and the Secretariat on all operational matters of the mission. Provision for such consultations is enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. This proposal is not geared at supplanting the Charter role of the Security Council but to ensuring greater coordination between the Security Council and troop contributors, on the one hand, and the Secretariat and the troop contributors, on the other. The objective of this proposal is to ensure unity of purpose between the Security Council, the troop contributors and the Secretariat on any given operation.

8. On 13 November 2000, the Security Council adopted resolution 1327 (2000), which included, inter alia, the following recommendations on consultations with the troop contributors:

> "*Encourages* the Secretary-General to begin his consultations with potential troop contributors well in advance of the establishment of peacekeeping operations, and requests him to report on his consultations during the consideration of new mandates.
>
> "*Underlines* the importance of an improved system of consultations among the troop-contributing countries, the Secretary-General and the Security Council, in order to foster a common understanding of the situation on the ground, of the mission's mandate and of its implementation.
>
> "*Agrees*, in this regard, to strengthen significantly the existing system of consultations through the holding of private meetings with troop-contributing countries, including at their request, and without prejudice to the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, in particular when the Secretary-General has identified potential troop-contributing countries for a new or

ongoing peacekeeping operation, during the implementation phase of an operation, when considering a change in, or renewal or completion of a peacekeeping mandate, or when a rapid deterioration in the situation on the ground threatens the safety and security of United Nations peacekeepers".

9. The United Nations General Assembly followed suit on 8 December 2000 by adopting resolution 55/135, endorsing the proposals, recommendations and conclusions of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (A/C.4/55/6). These included the following recommendations on consultations with the troop contributors under the section "Clear, credible and achievable mandates":

"The Special Committee emphasizes the need for clear, credible and achievable mandates and the necessity for significantly strengthening and formalizing the consultation process between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries in order to make it more meaningful, with due regard to the relevant provisions of the Charter. Such consultations should be held in a timely manner, and may be held at the request of troop-contributing countries, in particular when the Secretary-General has identified potential troop-contributing countries for a new or ongoing peacekeeping operation, and the Security Council is formulating the mandate. Consultations should also be held during the implementation phase of an operation, when considering a change in or renewal or completion of a peacekeeping mandate or when a rapid deterioration in the situation on the ground threatens the safety and security of United Nations peacekeepers. Such meetings should, as a general rule, be announced in the *Journal of the United Nations*.

"... Countries that have committed military and civilian police units to an operation should be invited to participate in meetings of the Security Council in which the Secretariat provides it with information on changes to a mission's mandate and concept of operation that have implications for the mission's use of force. While authorising the use of force, the Council should adhere to all relevant provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter.

"On matters affecting the safety and security of personnel, countries that have committed personnel to an operation should be fully and regularly briefed by the Secretariat. The Special Committee urges that the Secretariat's briefings to troop-contributing countries be timely, comprehensive and professional, and should, as a general rule, be accompanied by written briefs."